

what is the FCC protecting? There have been repeated attempts to raise fines for 'obsenity', which is offensive but not particularly world changing, yet when a public broadcast station (the Sinclair Group) uses public money and airwaves to air an expose on only one candidate for 'most powerful person in the world', it's acceptable? If a critical piece on Bush but not Kerry were run, this would still be obvious and biased partisan promotion, and I say this as someone who thinks there are several justifiable reasons to impeach Pres. Bush.

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.